

REMARKS

It is respectfully submitted that no new issues requiring further detailed consideration or search have been presented by the proposed amendments and that entry of the claim amendments is appropriate under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Entry of the amendment at least for purposes of appeal is respectfully requested in view of the fact that the amended claims contain subject matter from a dependent claim indicated as containing allowable subject matter in the outstanding Office Action.

Claims 18, 29, 30, 38, 41 and 43 have been amended to recite the subject matter of claim 20. It will be noted that it was acknowledged in the Office Action that claim 20 would be allowed if rewritten to include the subject matter of the claims from which it depends. Claim 18, as presently presented, now substantially recites the combination of the subject matter of claims 18 and 20. Moreover, claims 29 recites a document of value having the coating composition recited in claim 20, claim 30 recites a method for producing securing paper having the coating composition of claim 20, and claim 38 recites a security paper having the coating composition of claim 20. In addition, claim 41 recites a document of value formed of fibers having a dirt repellant surface coating including the composition of claim 20, and claim 43 essentially recites a method for making the document of value recited in claim 41.

Applicants submit that in view of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the acknowledgment of allowable subject matter in claim 20, the disclosures of Detrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,161,829), Martin (U.S. Patent 5,601,683) and Kaule (U.S. Patent 5,817,205) fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements or steps recited in claims 18, 29, 30, 38, 41 and 43. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18, 29, 30, 38, 41 and 43 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 21-28, which depend from claim 18, are at least patentable based on the dependency from claim 18 and their individually recited elements. Claims 31-37, which depend from claim 30, are at least patentable based on their

Application No.: 09/719,559
Examiner: Lawrence D. FERGUSON
Art Unit: 1774

dependency from claim 30 and their individually recited steps or elements. Claims 39-40, which depend from claim 38, are at least patentable based on their dependency from claim 38 and their individually recited elements. Claim 42 is at least patentable based on its dependency from claim 41 and its individually recited elements, and claims 44-45 are at least patentable based on their dependency from claim 43 and their individually recited elements.

Applicants submit that since the subject matter of allowable claim 20 has been incorporated into the independent claims of the present application, there are no new issues that have been raised since it is presumed that the subject matter of claim 20 in the context of security paper or documents has already been thoroughly searched by the Examiner. No new claims have been added to the present application.

In view of the amendments to the pending claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 18,19 and 21-45 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicants' Attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: December 10, 2003

final amendment 121703.wpd

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,205